

Application No. 10/708,205  
Docket No. 137229  
Amendment dated February 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2005

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-20 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that all of the claims were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0189722 to Hasz et al. (Hasz). In response, Applicants have amended the claims as set forth above. More particularly:

The specification has been amended at paragraph [0020] to correct a clerical error.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to specify that the wear-resistant alloy is a metallic alloy, consistent with their dependent claims 5 and 10 and in contradistinction to cobalt-containing nonmetallic compounds such as chromium carbide.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been further amended to require an aging step described in paragraph [0020] of the specification.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have also been amended to require that the machining step removes a surface portion of the braze tape(s). Support for this limitation can be found in paragraph [0021] of the specification.

Dependent claim 2 has been amended to eliminate the terms "powder," which lack antecedent basis.

Independent claim 12 and dependent claim 14 have been rewritten to

Application No. 10/708,205  
Docket No. 137229  
Amendment dated February 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2005

depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and recite a second aging step described in paragraph [0020] of the specification.

Dependent claims 13 and 15 have been rewritten to depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and specify a surface finish for the surface(s) of the wear-resistant coating(s) produced as a result of the machining step. Support for this limitation can be found in paragraph [0021] of the specification.

Claims 16-20 have been canceled without prejudice to Applicants.

Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Because independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-15 have been rewritten to depend from independent claims 1 and 8, and claims 16-20 have been canceled, the following remarks will be limited to independent claims 1 and 8 and their dependent claims 2-7 and 9-15.

The §102 rejection was on the basis of Hasz's disclosure of brazing sheets that can be bonded to a surface to form a wear coating. Hasz's brazing

Application No. 10/708,205  
Docket No. 137229  
Amendment dated February 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2005

sheets are formed to contain a "wear-resistant particulate phase" and a braze alloy, the former of which may be a ceramic material (such as chromium carbide) or a metallic alloy (such as a cobalt alloy). Hasz's examples describe processes for braze sheets containing chromium carbide as the wear-resistant particulate phase.


Hasz does not disclose or suggest an aging step after the braze sheets are bonded to the surface being repaired, as required by Applicants' independent claims 1 and 8. Furthermore, though Hasz discloses machining a diffusion coating from the surface of the wear-resistant coating (e.g., Hasz at paragraph [0037]), Hasz does not disclose or suggest machining the surface of the wear-resistant coating itself, as also required by Applicants' independent claims 1 and 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully believe that Hasz does not anticipate or obviate Applicants' process recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Applicants believe that Hasz also does not disclose or suggest the secondary aging step of new dependent claims 12 and 14 or the surface finish requirements of new dependent claims 13 and 15.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §102, and respectfully request that their patent application be given favorable reconsideration.

Application No. 10/708,205  
Docket No. 137229  
Amendment dated February 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 18, 2005

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter  
now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Domenica N.S. Hartman  
Reg. No. 32,701

February 20, 2006  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166